HAROLD WEISBERG

7627 Old Receiver Rd.
Frederick, MD 21702

9/9/94

Ms. Lesley Oelsner, associate general counsel
Random House
201 E. 50 St.,
New York, NY 10022

Dear Ms. Oelsner,

I am neither surprised nor disappointed not to have heard from you in response to my August 27 letter after I got yours.

Of course I've still not heard from Posner. But I did see the Anchor reprint and did notice that he did take what I said about Failure Analysis in Case Open seriously enough to add a lengthy footnote that is typical of his distortions and other dishonesties.

I think you'll recall that I said of your prize package that what he wrote about me ranged from deliberate distortions to outright lies.

But what I'd forgotten is that years ago Random House published the proof of one of his nastier nastinesses where he said I'd been fired by the government as an alleged security risk.

In I think 1947 Random House published Bert Andrews' Washington Witchhunt. I am one of those of whom he wrote, following a series in the New York Herald Tribune.

So that you can get full enjoyment of this I enclose the proof that you did publish it. And if you'd like I can also send you the news account of the departure from the government of the person responsible for that.

In some instances Andrews did not use names. So you can understand that I am one I enclose a letter to me after it was all over from your counsel. Two of whom I'd known when I got them to represent some of us. The one I did not know before then you will recognize as later a Supreme Court Justice. Arnold had been an appeals court judge and Porter a Federal Communications Commissioner. I've highlighted "vindication."

After all these years my recollection is indistinct, and I do not expect you to do any research on this because I think you'll be happy enough without that, but it is in my mind what connects Andrews with a Pulitzer.

I hope this can make you feel prouder and happier about your letter to me and about how responsible Random House is about what it published. At least once upon a time about what it did publish.

Sincerely,

Harold Weisberg

I have seen a copy of Posner's Anchor reprint and the note at its beginning. He is apparently impelled to lie as the presumed response to what he cannot make response to. He really has no need to establish himself as a world-class liar. He did that in the book you published. Nor does he have to continue to prove my point that he has trouble telling the truth by accident. In his note he said Case Open, to which neither he nor RH has been able to make any refutation, is my first to be published commercially. It is my fourth first published commercially and counting each edition as one, my 12th.

In connection with what I told you had been reported to me, that he was getting help from Harrison Livingstone - and I admit that taking Livingstone's word presents the same hazard as taking Posner's - I was surprised to get a letter from him in which he told me, "I'm glad ~~Random's lawyer~~ I helped Random's lawyers and they thanked me in writing."

Thus it would seem that it was not news to you, personally, despite your letter.

I'm told, not that he had any reason to delete it, that his reprint refers to the sales of my books as "dismal." One of those things he said I never had, commercial publication, was the 1966 Dell reprint of my first book. Its first of four printings was of 250,000 copies. If that is "dismal" how many did Random House publish of Posner's? Not even counting returns. Better than "dismal"? I understand not.

Dell then placed monthly ads of its best sellers. That was for six months its only advertised non-fiction best seller.

What to me is really dismal is commercializing intended dishonesty and then having it protected by those who have no more ~~regard~~ regard for truth or decency.

Hw